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Comments

CSU Chico prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the University Housing and Food Service Phase 1 complex (UHFS). The proposed MND and initial study was circulated for a 30-day review period from July 19 to August 17, 2007. During the review period, 15 comment letters were received (see Table 1). These letters are included as Attachment A to this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/6/2007</td>
<td>Jann Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/9/2007</td>
<td>Robert S. Fortino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/12/2007</td>
<td>Kasey Merrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8/13/2007</td>
<td>Jeanne Thatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/14/2007</td>
<td>Bob Vandagriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8/15/2007</td>
<td>Doris Meriam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8/15/2007</td>
<td>Brooke Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/15/2007</td>
<td>Jane Wanderer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/16/2007</td>
<td>California Department of Toxic Substance Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8/17/2007</td>
<td>Molly Amick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8/17/2007</td>
<td>City of Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8/17/2007</td>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8/17/2007</td>
<td>Sharon and Cliff Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8/17/2007</td>
<td>Lori and Gary Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8/17/2007</td>
<td>California Department of Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All comments received are included in the administrative record for the project and will be considered by the CSU Board of Trustees when considering potential approval of the proposed MND and UHFS project. The environmental issues raised in the comment letters are discussed below.
Responses to Environmental Issues

Air Quality

Comments 7, 8
Two comments question the effects of particulate matter (dust) during construction. As discussed in the initial study (pages 22-23), particulate matter emissions would be below the threshold of significance established by the Butte County Air Quality Management District. Mitigation Measures (Air-1 and Air-2) identified in the Master Plan EIR are included in the project to reduce PM10 and other criteria pollutants.

Biology

Comment 8
One comment identified a concern with effects to flora and fauna. Impacts to biological resources were analyzed in the initial study. No suitable wildlife habitat or mature trees eligible for protection under local ordinances are contained within the project site.

Geology and Soils

Comments 7, 8, 13
Several comments expressed concern with dewatering and settling, relating to the effects on foundations and swimming pools in particular. Dewatering is a process where shallow groundwater is pumped out of a construction site during construction of below grade facilities (such as basements). Groundwater depth is variable in the campus vicinity, but may be as shallow as nine feet in the project area (see Attachment B). It is conceivable that groundwater would be encountered during the excavation of the basement or foundations of the proposed buildings. Groundwater would be pumped and retained on-site in compliance with RWQCB regulations.

When large quantities of groundwater are pumped, settling of the soils can occur, which can potentially damage adjacent structures such as swimming pools or basement walls. However, in this case, any expected quantities of groundwater are comparatively small, and no below grade facilities are close enough to the project to be affected. As noted below, under vibration effects, the nearest private residential property is at least 375 feet away, which is much too far away to be affected by dewatering activity related to the proposed project.

See Attachment B, additional information provided by the University’s geotechnical engineers.
Hazards

Comments 7, 9
The initial study examined the potential for exposure to hazardous materials during demolition of the existing Activity Center, including lead, asbestos and PCBs. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, 2, and 3 specifically address these concerns. The potential impacts related to demolition would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures.

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted to identify any potential hazards related to the project and prior uses of the site. As noted above and in the initial study, the Phase 1 concluded that potentially significant hazards were confined to demolition of the existing structure. Prior to its current use, historical aerial photographs indicate the project site was used as a parking. Sometime prior to 1949, the site was used as family housing for returning World War II veterans attending the University. Records indicate the site was not used for intensive agricultural purposes for at least fifty years and likely much longer.

The non-potable water source used for landscape irrigation is an existing campus well, which has been tested for safety.

Hydrology & Water Quality

Comments 12, 15
Two of the public agency comment letters addressed issues of hydrology and water quality. As requested by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the initial study (page 3) notes that the project will require preparation of an NOI to obtain coverage under the general permit for storm water discharges associated with construction activity, and preparation of a SWPP. It is duly noted that the project will also comply with MS4 General Permit.

Regarding the DWR comment letter, the project is not located within a Designated Floodway. Big Chico Creek is a regulated waterway, per Title 23 California Code of Regulations Section 112. However, this project would not encroach within the streambed or floodway of Big Chico Creek.

Land Use

Comments 1, 2, 6, 7, 14
Comments were received regarding the projects height and proximity to the sidewalk on the north side. The proposed building is 64’6” high at the highest point of the roofline. The building is set back seven feet from the sidewalk along Legion Avenue. The project should be considered in the context of adjacent campus development, including the nine-story Whitney Hall.
One of the goals of the CSUC Master Plan is to accommodate growth through “intensified use of existing campus spaces through the removal of low density and aging facilities and replacing them with modern higher capacity facilities (CSUC 2005, page 3-1).” While some new property acquisitions will be required to accommodate growth, it is a goal of the University to maximize the use of the existing campus, thereby reducing the footprint of the campus, and the associated environmental effects of sprawl.

Projects located on the CSU Chico campus are not bound by the development standards contained in the City of Chico Municipal Code. The proposed project site has a City of Chico zoning designation of Secondary Open Space (OS2), which requires a 20 ft setback on all sides. However, the OS2 zoning designation of the project site is not consistent with the City’s General Plan designation of Public Facilities and Services (PF & S), which allows more intense development. Hypothetically, if the site’s zoning were consistent with its general plan designation of public facilities, and a proposed development was subject to City zoning standards, the setbacks would be considered on a case-by-case basis through the Conditional Use Permit process (see Section 19.50.030 of the Chico Municipal Code).

**Noise and Vibration**

**Comments 1, 2, 7, 8, 11**
Several comments were received regarding potential noise and vibration impacts. Noise impacts would primarily affect on-campus receptors. Mitigation measures have been included as part of the proposed project in order to reduce impacts related to noise and vibration, including limitations to hours of operation. In addition, project-specific measures are incorporated: limiting idling equipment, relocating equipment, and, if necessary, the use of plywood noise barriers and/or noise control blankets around stationary construction noise sources.

Vibration impacts to the adjacent campus buildings (Whitney, Tehama, Shasta, and Lassen Halls) are discussed in the initial study. Because vibration effects dissipate rapidly over distance, the off-campus residences identified in comment letters are too remote for potentially significant vibration impacts to affect them. Table N-5 of the Initial Study shows the potential vibration effects of the project at 25 feet, and at the nearest on-campus receptors (40 feet). The threshold for potential damage is 0.2 PPV, while the threshold for annoyance is 80 RMS. As discussed in the initial study, this threshold is exceeded for the closest on-campus buildings, primarily as a result of the pile driving activity (see Attachment B). Appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce this effect to less than significant levels.

The project will include fencing to close off the construction site, and will have posted signs warning of safety hazards, including high noise levels. The signs will include the name of the contractor and the telephone number of the project manager (as requested in several comments). On-campus residents, most affected by the construction, will receive information on the project. As described in mitigation measure Noise-6, the contractor and structural engineer will work to reduce noise and vibration effects of pile driving, by using the least impacting methods available.
Table 2, below, shows the vibration effects of pile driving at 375 feet (the nearest off-campus residence). Most of the off-campus residences are further away, and would have corresponding decreases in vibration. Even using this “worst case” scenario, the vibration effects on off-campus residences are less than significant. The vibration levels would be too low to damage foundations or walls at these residences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment/Activity</th>
<th>PPV at 25 ft (inches/second)</th>
<th>PPV at nearest private receptor</th>
<th>RMS at 25 ft (Vdb)</th>
<th>RMS at nearest private receptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Pile Driver</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Building can be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels of 0.2 PPV without experiencing structural damage.
*The nearest private receptor was set at 375 feet.
*The human annoyance response level is 80 RMS.


**Recreation**

**Comment 4**

A comment was received regarding a loss of open space due to the construction of the proposed project. The project site currently contains the Residence Hall Activity Center, which is a tall single-story building located in the center of the site. The rest of the site is currently paved bicycle and vehicular parking. While a portion of the project area does not currently have structures on it, it is not recreational open space or green space. No recreational open space or green space will be lost or converted as a result of the proposed project. Indoor recreational space, of the sort provided by the existing Activity Center, will be included in the proposed UHFS Phase 1 facility.

The University acknowledges that the current campus does not meet CSU standards for recreational facilities, including open space. The Master Plan, which includes this project, provides for the expansion of recreational facilities. The Wildcat Activity Center is nearing the construction phase. Additional facilities, including play fields, will be constructed to meet campus demand. Most of these facilities, such as the Rio Chico Physical Education and Aquatic Center Facility, will be available to members of the public in addition to CSU students. The Campus Master Plan 2004 contains adequate additional recreation facilities to accommodate the projected student population.

**Public Services**

**Comment 7**

One comment cites student behavior as an existing problem and questions the effect of campus growth. The effects of the proposed project on public services are addressed in the initial study. Student conduct is a major concern of the University, although it does not constitute a physical change in the environment, and therefore is not within the scope of analysis required by CEQA.
Transportation and Traffic

Comments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14

The Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project uses the Master Plan EIR as a basis for discussing traffic impacts, as the project is within the scope of the Master Plan. Comments were received indicating that the proposed project would increase traffic along Legion Avenue and in the Mansion Park neighborhood, as well as contributing to a campus parking deficit. Twelve ADA spaces will be displaced as part of project construction; however, they will be replaced temporarily throughout the project, as well as permanently within another project. Replacement bicycle parking will also be included. The University is currently studying the best location and design for the replacement parking within the housing area. It should be noted that the new bicycle parking will be more efficient than the current parking (which consists of very basic racks placed in converted automobile parking spaces). No new additional on-site automobile parking (beyond the replacement ADA spaces) is included as part of the proposed project; as a result, traffic on Legion Avenue and through the Mansion Park neighborhood should remain similar to what currently exists.

The project would increase campus traffic and parking demand consistent with the CSUC Master Plan EIR. As noted in the initial study, the Phase 1 project is slightly larger than the first phase identified in the Master Plan. However, the number of residents (bed) is still within the range of on-campus housing planned for in the Master Plan and analyzed in the EIR. As discussed above, because the project does not add on-site parking, Legion Avenue would not experience a noticeable increase in traffic, other than temporary construction traffic. The University will work with the contractor and local residents to minimize construction traffic on Legion Avenue.

According to the Campus Master Plan Draft EIR, the University has an estimated parking deficit of 305 spaces under current conditions, and the proposed project would contribute to the deficit, by adding 228 residents. However, the parking supply deficit due to the construction of the project would be an interim effect, as on-campus parking is included in the build-out of the Master Plan. In addition, it is the goal of the Master Plan to increase the use of alternative transportation and reduce the need for vehicles to be parked on campus. The University will be encouraging on-campus residents not to bring automobiles to campus their first year. Transportation Demand Measures (TDM) being taken by the University include:

- Assessment and recommendations of best TDM practices for the CSUC campus, in relationship to transportation issues for faculty, staff and students. Special emphasis should be given to promote alternate transportation solutions for students who live within one mile of campus.
- Development of specific marketing tools to best promote TDM at CSUC.

---

1 The Master Plan first phase identified 196 beds. The proposed UHFS Phase 1 provides 228 beds (including 6 resident advisors and 2 staff). The Master Plan, at build-out, anticipates 1,298 total new beds, located at the Whitney and College Park sites.
- Prioritization of project target areas.
- Cost estimates for implementing and sustaining the TDM efforts.
- Definition of the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the TDM partner organizations.

This information is available at the University’s Transportation & Parking Services (TAPS) website, [http://www.csuchico.edu/taps](http://www.csuchico.edu/taps).

The transportation effects of the dining facility are less than significant. A dining facility currently exists in Whitney Hall. The new facility, as noted in the initial study, will require up to 15 additional full-time employees. It is anticipated that at least five of these positions will be filled by current part-time or student employees, resulting in ten net new employees on campus. These employees may park in existing university staff parking lots, but would be encouraged to take alternative transportation modes to work.

Construction traffic would affect the local roadway system during the construction period. However, this effect is temporary, and would not significantly affect levels of service on local roadways.

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

CEQA states that when mitigation measures are required to reduce or avoid a potentially significant impact, a program for monitoring or reporting those measures shall be adopted by the Lead Agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15097). The purpose of the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) is to ensure timely compliance with required mitigation measures.
### TABLE 3
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure AES-1 (Master Plan #3.1-2a): Future proposals for the rehabilitation, renovation, and/or replacement of structures on the Chico campus shall adhere to the design principles and characteristics set forth in the Campus Master Plan 2004. These standards include: • Common building materials and colors: - red brick walls; - potential limited use of concrete for building columns, surrounds, lintels, planter seat walls; - iron and steel railings, low fencing, trash receptacles/surrounds; - curved red tile roofs, gable and hip types in the historic core area. • Modernistic to modern with classical forms and elements as stylistic constants. • Landscaping, particularly trees, to form a soft contrast and frame to campus buildings contributing to the unification of the overall visual environment.</td>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Final plan check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure AES-2 (Master Plan #3.1-3a): New lighting proposed for future projects as a result of implementation of the Master Plan shall be directed downward and shall not shine onto adjacent properties. Additionally, all new lighting shall adhere to the guidelines in the Master Plan, including: 1. The offsite visibility and potential glare of the lighting will be restricted by specification of non-glare fixtures, and placement of lights to direct illumination into only those areas where it is needed. 2. Appropriate fixture selection and light placement shall minimize light pollution and enhance natural color rendition. All lighting shall utilize refractive lenses and be shielded to reduce glare into buildings and neighboring areas. 3. Walkway lighting fixtures shall not be mounted higher than twenty feet unless necessary for security reasons.</td>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Final plan check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measure AES-3 (Master Plan #3.1-3b): Individual developments associated with the Master Plan shall minimize lighting to areas required for safety, security, or normal operations on the main campus and at the Agricultural Teaching and Research Center (ATRC) and shield lighting from public view to the greatest extent possible. The direction and shielding of lighting shall be regulated to reduce light spillage, light pollution, and glare. Highly directional light fixtures shall be used with non-glare lighting fixtures. All</td>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Final Plan Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure Air-1 (Master Plan #3.2-1):</td>
<td>Implementation Responsibility</td>
<td>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Consistent with BCAQMD Indirect Source Review Guidelines, the following demolition and construction dust and equipment exhaust emissions measures shall be required in all construction contracts:</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>During construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Watering should be used to control dust generation during demolition of structures and break-up of pavement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cover all trucks hauling demolition debris from the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use dust-proof chutes to load debris into trucks whenever feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water for construction dust control shall be available at all times. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil and wind exposure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On-site vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cover inactive storage piles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved streets adjacent to the development site should be swept or washed at the end of each day as necessary to remove excessive accumulations of silt and/or mud which may have accumulated as a result of activities on the development site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pose a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours. The telephone number of the BCAQMD shall also be visible to ensure compliance with BCAQMD Rule 201 and 207 (Nuisance and Fugitive Dust Emissions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide temporary traffic control as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow (e.g. flag person).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Require contractors to minimize exhaust emissions by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and proper timing according to manufacturer’s specifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contractor shall minimize equipment idling time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure AIR-2 (Master Plan #3.2-3):</strong></td>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Final plan check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future development that occurs as a result of the implementation of the Master Plan shall adhere to the following standards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and the use of appropriate landscaping that maximizes the potential of solar design principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of solar water heating for at least 25 percent of the building floor area.¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate shade trees, adequate in number and proportional to the project size, throughout the site to reduce building heating and cooling requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools.²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure CUL-1 (Master Plan #3.4-2b):</strong></td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Construction Inspector &amp; Archaeological Consultant</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSU Chico will retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant that has expertise in California prehistory to monitor ground-disturbing or vegetation removal activity within the project parcel. If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit will cease. The archaeological monitor will be empowered to temporarily redirect crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. The monitor will immediately notify CSU Chico of the encountered archaeological deposit. The monitor will, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to CSU Chico. If the archaeological monitor determines that the area being excavated does not contain archaeological materials, the monitor will modify the level of monitoring as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The archaeological monitor will also retain a representative of the Mechoopda Indian Tribe to be present to act as a liaison to the Mechoopda Indian Tribe and to act as a “most likely descendant” should Native American internments be unearthed during construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If CSU Chico, in consultation with the archaeological monitor, determines that a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This standard is a campus goal and may not apply to individual buildings.
² This goal is addressed campus-wide, and may not apply to the UHFS Phase 1.
significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, CSU Chico will:

Avoid any adverse effects on the significant archaeological resource to the extent feasible; or

Implement an archaeological data recovery program (ADRP) (unless the archaeologist determines that the resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible). If the circumstances warrant an archaeological data recovery program, an ADRP will be conducted. The project archaeologist and CSU Chico will meet and consult to determine the scope of the ADRP. The archaeologist will prepare a draft ADRP that will be submitted to CSU Chico for review and approval. The ADRP will identify how the proposed data recovery program would preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain (i.e., the ADRP will identify the scientific/historical research questions that are applicable to the expected resource, the data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions). Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods will not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-2**: In the event any archaeological artifacts or dense deposits of shell, historical refuse, faunal and/or floral remains are found during construction, all construction activities within 50 feet will be immediately halted and CSU Chico will be notified. A qualified archaeological monitor will inspect the findings within 24 hours of the discovery. If the site is determined to contain, or potentially contain, significant cultural resources, or those that qualify as historical resources or as unique archaeological resources per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, funding will be provided to identify, record, report, evaluate, and recover the resources as necessary. Construction within the area of the find shall not recommence until impacts on the historical or unique archaeological resource are mitigated. Additionally, Public Resources Code Section 5097.993 stipulates that a project sponsor must inform project personnel that collection of any Native American artifact is prohibited by law.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3**: If human skeletal remains are uncovered during project construction, the construction monitor or project manager will immediately halt work, contact the Butte County coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols set forth in Section 15064.5 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. If the County coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the project proponent will contact the representative of the Mechoopda Indian Tribe. Per Public Resources Code 5097.98, CSU Chico shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Geology, Soils, and Seismicity | Mitigation Measure GEO-1 (Master Plan #3.5-3): Future development projects that may occur as a result of implementation of the CSU Chico Campus Master Plan shall comply with Best Management Practices. Examples of Best Management Practices include, but are not limited to the following:  
- Placing fiber rolls around onsite drain inlets to prevent sediment and construction related debris from entering inlets.  
- Placing fiber rolls along the perimeter of the site to reduce runoff flow velocities and prevent sediment from leaving the site.  
- Placing silt fences down gradient of disturbed areas to slow down runoff and retain sediment.  
- Specifying that all disturbed soil will be seeded, mulched, or otherwise protected by October 15th.  
- Stabilizing construction entrance to reduce the tracking of mud and dirt onto public roads by construction vehicles.  
- Applying hydraulic mulch that temporarily protects exposed soil from erosion by raindrop impact or wind. | Contractor | Construction Inspector | During construction |
<p>| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Prior to deconstruction, recycling, and demolition of the existing Residence Hall Activity Center, asbestos and lead-based paint surveys must be conducted. Information on the presence or absence of asbestos will need to be indicated in the NESHAP notification form prior to significant renovation or demolition of the Residence Hall Activity Center building. Information on the presence or absence of lead-based paint will be needed for proper employee training and work practices during demolition of the Residence Hall Activity Center building. | CSU Chico Facilities Planning | CSU Chico Facilities Planning | Prior to Demolition |
| | Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: | Contractor | Construction Inspector | During Demolition |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon demolition of the existing Residence Hall Activity Center building, fluorescent lamps not designated for reuse should be shipped to a universal waste recycling facility once they have been appropriately packaged.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>During Demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure HAZ-3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care should be exercised when handling or recycling the electrical equipment at the proposed project site during eventual deconstruction, recycling, and demolition of the existing Residence Hall Activity Center building. Ballasts containing PCBs are considered “Hazardous Waste,” and must be properly manifested for disposal at a hazardous waste facility. Contractors who may perform PCB related work (e.g., inspection, removal, clean-up) must be trained and qualified to do so.</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Construction Inspector / Fire Department</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure HAZ-4 (Master Plan #3.6-2):</strong> Prior to closure of any street segments, a plan should be developed that will ensure that there will be no interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Noise-1 (Master Plan # 3.9-3a):</strong> All heavy construction equipment and all stationary noise sources (such as diesel generators) shall be in good working order and have manufacturer mufflers.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Noise-2 (Master Plan #3.9-3b):</strong> Equipment warm up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located in an area as far away from existing residences as is feasible.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Noise-3:</strong> All outdoor construction shall be between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. daily except Sundays and holidays. Outdoor construction activities between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and holidays shall meet at least one of the following noise limitations:</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No individual piece of equipment shall produce a noise level exceeding 83 dBA at a distance of twenty-five feet from the source. If the device is housed within a structure on the property, the measurement shall be made outside the structure at a distance as close to twenty-five feet from the equipment as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The noise level at any point outside of the property plane of the project shall not exceed 86 dBA (CSU CHICO 2005).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor construction activities between 9:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. shall comply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the standards in Table N-2, as measured at the nearest residential receptor.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>Prior and during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Noise-4:</strong> To further mitigate noise levels during construction the following noise attenuation methods shall apply if students are in residence during construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pile driving and/or other extreme noise-generating activities (greater than 90 dBA) shall be limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No extreme noise-generating activities shall be allowed on weekends and holidays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If noise levels exceed 86dBA, the contractor shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including, but not limited to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• changing the location of stationary construction equipment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• shutting off idling equipment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• rescheduling construction activity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• installing acoustic barriers (such as FHWA specified plywood barriers or noise control blankets) or around stationary construction noise sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Noise-5:</strong> The HVAC shall be designed and located to meet the Noise Ordinance standards of Table N-2.</td>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Prior and during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure Noise-6:</strong> The project structural engineer will work with the contractor to minimize vibration associated with pile driving. The contractor shall document the pre-construction conditions of all adjacent structures through video or photographs. Post-construction conditions shall be evaluated and any construction-related damage shall be repaired.</td>
<td>Project Engineer and Contractor</td>
<td>Construction Inspector</td>
<td>Prior, during, and after construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure PUB-1 (Master Plan #3.11-1a):</strong> Currently there are several “Blue Light” emergency telephones located throughout the campus which ring directly into the Communications Center of the University Police Department. These auto-dialing phones may be used to summon emergency police, fire or medical assistance. Before construction is completed on new facilities on the main campus, new “Blue Light” phones can be added to ensure safety at these locations.</td>
<td>Project Architect</td>
<td>CSU Chico Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Final plan check</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A
Comment Letters
August 6, 2007

ESA
8950 Cal Center Drive
Building 3
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Attn: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager

Re: UHFS Ph 1/CEQA

Dear Mr. Grattidge,

I have the following concerns regarding the new dormitory planned for CSU, Chico.

1. I believe the building in set too close to the sidewalk on the North side facing Legion Ave. I believe the University should adhere to the setback requirements of the City of Chico. Having this large 5 story building in such close proximity to the sidewalk will create a solid barrier along the Legion Ave. corridor.

2. There is one East bound entrance on Legion Ave into and through the Mansion Park neighborhood to reach the main arterial, the Esplanade. The increase in traffic and car emissions will impact the neighborhood much more severely than what is stated in the document. I believe there should be restrictions on through automobile traffic into the Mansion Park neighborhood with this addition.

3. I do not believe asking the students to not bring their cars will have any effect on reducing the number of vehicles. The vehicle number will significantly increase with the addition of 228 persons living in the area. I believe there should be absolute restrictions on residents of the dorms having vehicles on campus. Many colleges and universities do not allow students, especially freshmen, to have a vehicle on their campuses.

4. On page 52 of the document, it is stated there will be sustained pile driving. The homes in the residential area adjacent to the building project date back as far as the 1920’s and this ground vibration could cause damage to the structures. For instance, this could include cracked plaster or sheetrock, uneven settling, or could severely harm the integrity of the structures.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Jann Reed

Jann Reed
347 Legion Ave.
Chico, CA
August 8, 2007

ESA
8950 Cal Center Drive
Building 3
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Re: UHFS Ph 1/CEQA

Attn: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager

Dear Mr. Grattidge:

I strongly concur with the comments of our across-the-street neighbor, Jann Reed. You are dealing with multi-millions of property value (we own 346 and 329 Legion Avenue) and want to be assured that traffic impacts, the footprint for the proposed building and the sustained pile driving are mitigated.

Thank you for your consideration and we await your reply.

Regards,

ROBERT S. FORTINO

Attachment
August 6, 2007

ESA
8950 Cal Center Drive
Building 3
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Attn: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager

Re: UHFS Ph 1/CEQA

Dear Mr. Grattidge,

I have the following concerns regarding the new dormitory planned for CSU, Chico.

1. I believe the building in set too close to the sidewalk on the North side facing Legion Ave. I believe the University should adhere to the setback requirements of the City of Chico. Having this large 5 story building in such close proximity to the sidewalk will create a solid barrier along the Legion Ave. corridor.

2. There is one East bound entrance on Legion Ave into the neighborhood and through the neighborhood to reach the main arterial, the Esplanade. The increase in traffic and car emissions will impact the neighborhood much more severely than what is stated in the document. I believe there should be restrictions on through automobile traffic into the Mansion Park neighborhood with this addition.

3. I do not believe asking the students to not bring their cars will have any effect on reducing the number of vehicles. The vehicle number will significantly increase with the addition of 228 persons living in the area. I believe there should be absolute restrictions on residents of the dorms having vehicles on campus. Many colleges and universities do not allow students, especially freshmen, to have a vehicle on their campuses.

4. On page 52 of the document, it is stated there will be sustained pile driving. The homes in the residential area adjacent to the building project date back as far as the 1920’s and this ground vibration could cause damage to the structures. For instance, this could include cracked plaster or sheetrock, uneven settling, or could severely harm the integrity of the structures.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Jann Reed

Jann Reed
347 Legion Ave.
Chico, CA
From: Kasey Merrill [kmerrill27@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2007 5:39 PM
To: uhfs1
Subject: Public comment on Chico State Housing Project

Brian Grattidge, Project Manager
8950 Cal Center Drive, Building 3, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Dear Brian,

Please accept this as my response to the Notice of Intent to adopt a negative declaration related to the Chico State University housing and food service phase 1.

I understand students do better in the long term if they are housed on campus at least during their freshman year. Chico State is a wonderful asset to our Chico community.

My concern centers on parking of the vehicles that come to our community with the students. The proposed housing and food service project removes parking. In its current configuration, CSUC has a greater need for parking than is currently available in the 'near campus footprint'. My neighborhood is involved in neighborhood planning, and the parking impact from a collection of institutions is key in all discussions.

I encourage CSUC to directly engage with the City of Chico and the surrounding neighborhoods to take responsibility for their fair share of the parking solution. The parking solution is both strategic and economic in nature. Working, tangible solutions to the parking impacts are not addressed in the Master Plan.

Thank you for helping us to get the best University project possible for our community.

Sincerely,
Kasey Merrill
1627 Arcadian Avenue
Chico, CA 95926
(530)343-8334

No virus found in this outgoing message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.11.15/949 - Release Date: 8/12/2007 11:03 AM
Jeanne Thatcher  
300 Legion Avenue  
Chico, CA 95926

13 August 2007

Brian Grattidge, Project Manager  
ESA  
8950 Cal Center Drive  
Building 3, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95826

Dear Mr. Grattidge:

I am writing to you in regard to California State University, Chico, plans for expansion. The campus is land-locked, and is already pressing against and into historically sensitive neighborhoods and public areas. The future expansion plans for CSUC cannot avoid negative impacts on the city of Chico. Please note the following:

1. CSUC has the least parking available of any campus in the California University system. When students are attending classes during normal semesters community members cannot find parking for many blocks surrounding the campus. This situation makes it hard on downtown businesses, and I know people who live far from campus who cannot park in front of their own houses. One of the main issues confronting our city council is the provision of more parking. The problem here is that taxation on the citizens of Chico, instead of the entire state of California, would have to cover the expense because the university makes either no attempt, or very feeble attempts, to provide parking for their faculty, staff or students. There are only about 3,000 parking spaces for over 20,000 faculty, staff and students.

2. Based on the extreme problems with parking in Chico, it is unconscionable for the university to continue to expand, and add new classrooms and dorms on campus. There are absolutely no parking spaces for the currently planned new dorm building, which is to be built to house 228 students.
The students living on campus now have practically no parking as it is.

3. CSUC does not have the amount of green space they are supposed to be responsible for providing. More building on the little open space available now is going to make matters worse.

4. CSUC is placing an unfair and destructive burden on the citizens of Chico through its unfettered building. Normal life is becoming more difficult for citizens living in the shadow of the ever-expanding giant living in our midst.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Thatcher
I question why any additional on campus housing is being considered when the current lack of student or faculty parking has yet to be resolved. I have resided on west sacramento avenue since I attended C.S.U.C. in 1974. Parking was difficult in the '70's and has progressively worsened year after year. Recently incurring a personal cost of $4900 dollars I added an additional parking space to my property to accommodate our second vehicle. Friends and visitors are unable to park in front of or near my residence when C.S.U.C. is in session. The C.S.U.C. faculty crowds all street parking by 7:30 AM, Monday through Friday. Then as students arrive they push available parking to my residents to three to four blocks from my front door. Simple put "what's up", do you have any sort of planning department that addresses the basics of more students and faculty on the campus? More students and additional faculty equals additional vehicles roaming the streets in search of a place to park. Last year I returned home with boat in tow to find my driveway blocked by cars who's owners were in no doubt late for class, unable to find parking resulted in their infringement into my driveway access, preventing my backing up my boat into its space. At an additional cost of $1400 I purchased a utility trailer to take up a street parking space adjacent to my drive to prevent students from blocking my access. How many students and faculty attend C.S.U.C. campus? How many parking spaces does C.S.U.C. provide? How many of those spaces are overcharged for so that they are not adequately utilized? Where's my public parking space- apparently no where near my house. Perhaps I can start utilizing a shuttle from?????? Please, no additional housing, students or staff until the parking fiasco is addressed. The critical parking issue has been surpassed. Plan ahead.
August 2, 2007

Dennis C. Graham, Vice President for Business and Finance
8950 Cal Center Drive, Building 3, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Dear Mr. Graham:

This letter is written in response to your recent informational letter about two buildings that are planned to be built between Whitney Hall, Lassen and Shasta Resident Halls. The area you plan to build, to me, is too small for these two buildings.

I am a resident of Mansion Park and have lived in my home for 47 years. I have been through so many building projects on Chico University grounds. If these two buildings are built, I do not want any large trucks driving up and down our street. We are so impacted now, more traffic will probably make it impossible to get out of our driveways. We do live in a permit zone area so students should not park in this area, the fine is not small.

Please reconsider your plans and give some consideration to us as residents of this area.

Sincerely,

Doris (Sherman) Meriam
520 Citrus Avenue
Chico, CA 95926
530-342-4175

RECEIVED
AUG 15 2007
by BJO
From: Brooke Mundy [healhandhealheart@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2007 2:01 PM
To: uhfs1
Subject: Attention: Brian Grattidge

UHFS Ph 1/CEZA in care of ESA,
8950 Cal Drive, Building 3, Suite 300
Sacramento, Ca  95826

Attention: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager

From: Brooke Mundy, 340 Mansion Ave,
      Chico, CA  95926
      530-343-2853

Dear Mr. Grattidge,

I have the following concerns in regards to the California State University, Chico proposed construction of University Housing and Food Service.

My biggest concern is the fact that it would have a 100,722 sq. ft. basement. My neighbor who passed away last year told me that when construction workers built Holt Hall in the 70’s, they came across an underground lake. When they drained this and then filled it up with soil, it forced the water elsewhere creating this pressure, cracking her foundation and pool. She also said that all the pools in the neighborhood received damage. I have also heard that when they started construction on the new Bell Memorial Student Union in the late 90’s that they came across the same issue. That construction was delayed for 4 months while they pumped water from this site. What have we done to this area with these two structures?

In the Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration states that there will be sustained pile driving. Looking up pile driving I came across a statement that said nearby buildings may be adversely affected by the vibration levels. Some of the Mansion Park homes were built as early as the 1920’s. Our home personally was built in the 1930’s. What kind of effects do you think that this will have on our homes? What measures will be taken to insure the structural integrity of our homes? What measures will be taken to prevent cracking in foundations and basements as well as plaster walls? Will our homes be inspected before and after?

In the Master Plan it was estimated that 196 beds would be available now the numbers are at 226, which is a 15% increase. Whitney Hall has 544 beds; both Lassen and Shasta Halls each have 210. This will be a 23% increase on students. I feel that this will have a major impact on my neighborhood. This is not taking into account the number of cafeteria workers, or foot traffic, or automobiles. The campus should be forced to construct one of the two car garages at the same time. Building this dorm will also remove 12 handicap parking places. Where are people to park? I can personally tell you that there is no place. Because of the overflow auto parking in front of my house, I often can’t park in front of my house.

If a garbage truck drives down my street with an excess of speed it will actually knock the knocker on my front door. I don’t want any construction equipment or workers using my street. There is already too much traffic on this one way street during the school year. I think that Legion should be closed off like it uses to be.

When I talk to the parents of the students, they always say how they love the charm of the campus, the
creek, the trees and the beautiful old buildings. From the sketch of the building you propose, I think you are taking away from what people love about this campus.

The document also states that there will be a seven foot set back to provide a landscaping buffer along Legion. I just don’t understand how seven feet could buffer anything.

I don’t feel at the present that the college admonishes and calls to account unacceptable student behavior the way that it should. With an increase of 23 percent on campus there is the strong likelihood if even greater disorder. They don’t follow the laws they ride their bikes down the street the wrong way. They smoke their cigarettes and marijuana in the alley, plus whatever else it is that they do with cut off pens. The college should need to up their security with this new growth.

I also have concern that campus authorities really don’t take care of the campus the way it should be and yet you want to keep building on to it. From my front porch I can see 4 dead trees three are in front of the Julia Morgan house. Mind you these are not just little trees these are trees that are approximately over 4 stories high. With these visible safety issues, I am concerned about what will happen while you undertake this major construction.

I also have concerns about the pollution (equipment, dust, possible asbestos, noise pollution) generated by this construction.

Please consider my concerns!

Thank you,

Brooke Mundy
From: Jane Wanderer [jwanderer@pacbell.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2007 10:32 AM
To: uhfs1
Subject: UHFS Ph 1/CEQA Comments and Concerns
Attention: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager

From: Jane Wanderer
346 Mansion Avenue
Chico, CA 95926
530-332-9200
(corner of Mansion and Citrus Avenues)

Particular concerns I have relative to the demolition, construction and ongoing impact of the UHFS Ph1/CEQA project are:

1. I have asthma and COPD (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) and my breathing may be significantly impaired due to the increased particulate and any other factors related to air quality.
2. My home was built in 1936 and is not bolted to the foundation. The increased seismic activity of the construction (digging, pile driving, large vehicle traffic, etc.) may damage my home and/or foundation. This home has a partial basement.
3. I do not know the water table or other information regarding the soil in this area. There is a creek nearby and anecdotal information reports the necessity of significant pumping and removal of water before construction of other nearby CSUC buildings could be completed. I am concerned that movement of soil and water in the construction area may impact the stability of my foundation or cause flooding into the basement of my dwelling.
4. I request that no large construction vehicles use Mansion, Citrus or Legion east of Citrus for access and egress to the construction site.
5. What are the specific plans to monitor all the mitigation activities and will an emergency number be available 24/7 should any significant problems occur outside of normal business hours?

I have only related personal concerns in this letter. Of course, I am also concerned about the impact on the flora and fauna of the surrounding area as well as for the safety of the many people who transit this area daily.

I welcome improvements made to the University and appreciate the strong positive influence the University has on our community. Just please protect my health and my home in the process!

Sincerely,
August 16, 2007

Mr. Joel Trenalone  
Facilities Planning Office  
California State University Chico  
Chico, CA 95929

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHICO UNIVERSITY HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE PHASE I, CHICO, BUTTE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA (SCH 2007052058)

Dear Mr. Trenalone:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), dated July 19, 2007, for the subject project. The due date to submit comments is August 17, 2007.

Based on a review of the MND, DTSC would like to provide the following comments:

1. The project is a further development of the California State University (CSU) Chico campus, including demolition of an existing Residence Hall Activity Center and removal of paved parking areas followed by the construction of two new buildings, to be utilized for various student services, on a 1.7 acre portion of the campus.

2. If demolitions of old structures will occur, lead-based paint and organochlorine pesticides from termiticides may be potential environmental concerns at the site. DTSC recommends that these environmental concerns be investigated and possibly mitigated, in accordance with DTSC's "Interim Guidance, Evaluation of School Sites with Potential Soil Contamination as a Result of Lead From Lead-Based Paint, Organochlorine Pesticides from Termiticides, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Electrical Transformers", dated June 9, 2006.

3. Information regarding the history of the site prior to the construction of the existing Residence Hall Activity Center is not included within the MND. Additional information regarding the site's history should be obtained and evaluated to adequately determine if there are any additional environmental concerns.
4. If the site was used for agricultural purposes for any length of time since 1950, pesticides (e.g., DDT, DDE, toxaphene) and fertilizers (usually containing heavy metals) commonly used as part of agricultural operations would likely be present. These agricultural chemicals are persistent and bio-accumulative toxic substances. DTSC has developed the "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Soils (Second Revision)", dated August 2002. This Guidance should be followed for sampling agricultural properties where development is anticipated.

5. According to the MND, landscape water is obtained from a non-potable well on the campus. Water supplied to the site should be properly evaluated under the most current regulations and standards of the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the appropriate regulatory agency. CSU Chico is responsible for complying with all federal, state and local agency requirements regardless of the source of water to be supplied to the site for use in any capacity.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Mr. Christopher Frost at (714) 484-5314 or me at (818) 551-2860.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For Ken Chiang
Senior Hazardous Substances Scientist
School Program and Engineering/Geology Support Division

cc: See next page.
cc: Mr. Brian Grattidge (via email)  
ESA – Sacramento Office  

State Clearinghouse (via email)  
Office of Planning and Research  

Mr. Guenther W Moskat (via email)  
CEQA Tracking Center – Sacramento HQ  

Mr. Ken Chiang (via email)  
School Program – Glendale  

Mr. Christopher Frost (via email)  
School Program – Cypress  

SP&E/GD Reading File – Glendale  

CEQA Reading File – Glendale
Molly Amick, CANA Board Member
1065 Citrus Avenue
Chico, CA  95926

c: council member through dpresson

Get a sneak peek of the all-new AOL.com.
August 16, 2007

ESA
Attn: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager
8950 Cal Center Drive, Building 3, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Fax to: (916) 564-4501
E-mail: UHFS1@esassoc.com

Re: University Housing and Food Service, Phase 1
California State University, Chico
Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Mr. Grattidge:

After review of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project, the City of Chico Planning Services Department has the following comments:

1. **Noise.** According to the Initial Study, pile-driving activities will generate noise levels estimated at 101 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. As indicated on page 43 of the IS, human exposure to sound above roughly 90 dB can cause permanent hearing loss. Because construction-related noises greater than 90 dBA were not addressed in the Master Plan EIR, Planning staff strongly recommends that additional mitigation measures be required to reduce the incidence of exposure to noise levels over 90 dBA. These measures could include any or all of the following: fencing to keep the general public a greater distance from extreme noise-generating activities; posting signs informing the public that they are entering a high-noise area; circulating educational materials and earplugs to those residing near the construction zone; investigating the feasibility of alternate construction techniques which diminish or eliminate the need for pile-driving; and potentially timing construction so that some or all of the extreme noise-generating construction takes place when CSUC is not in session.

2. **Bicycle Parking.** The Initial Study should indicate the number of displaced bicycle parking spaces during the construction of the UHFS Phase 1 project, the number of new bicycle parking spaces provided once the project is constructed, and any provisions for temporary bicycle parking areas while the project is being constructed. Additional bicycle parking spaces should be provided during construction, and adequate bicycle parking spaces provided adjacent to the UHFS Phase 1 project when complete. City Planning staff recommends use of an inverted U-type bicycle rack which supports the bicycle frame at two points (such as the Dero Hoop Rack or Swerve Rack - see www.dero.com) without any likelihood of bending the front wheel rim.
3. **Vehicle Parking.** Continue working with the City to reduce trip generation rates, and provide new parking facilities to serve new construction, as set forth in the Master Plan and by implementing previous agreements made with the City.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Negative Declaration, and for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or Associate Planner Greg Redeker at 879-6800.

Sincerely,

Mark Wolfe
Principal Planner

cc: CM, ACM, BDSD
Joel Trenalone, CSU Chico, Chico, CA 95929
16 August 2007

Mr. Joel Trenalone
California State University, Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929-0018

COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE CSU CHICO UNIVERSITY HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE PHASE I PROJECT, CHICO, BUTTE COUNTY

On 20 July 2007, our office received a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration, an Environmental Initial Study and Request for Comments Letter from your office regarding the proposed development referenced above. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) is a responsible agency for this project, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Request for Comments Letter contained a cover sheet stating California State University Chico is proposing to construct a University Housing and Food Service Phase 1 complex on campus. The site is approximately 1.7 acres and bounded by track and playing fields for the nearby Chico Senior High School. Phase I consists of constructing two buildings: a university housing and a food service facility for students and a program building.

The following comments are provided to help outline the potential permitting required by the Regional Water Board’s agency, policy issues concerning the project, and suggestions for mitigation measures. Our present comments focus primarily on discharges regulated under our CWA §401 and storm water programs.

Water Board entitlements include:
- Storm water and other wastewater discharges
  CWA §402 NPDES permit

The following summarizes project permits that may be required by our agency depending upon potential impacts to water quality:

General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit) – Land disturbances on proposed projects of 1 acre or more requires the landowner to obtain coverage under the General Permit. As the land disturbance for the CSU Chico Housing and Food Service Phase I Project will be in excess of 1 acre, the owner of the property will need to file a Notice of Intent (NOI), along with a vicinity map, a Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and appropriate fees to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), prior to the commencement of activities on site. The owner may call...
our office to receive a permit package or download it off the Internet at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/stormwtr/index.html.

Phase II Storm Water Permit
The City of Chico is required to comply with the State's Storm Water Permit for Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. Under this permit the City of Chico must ensure that new developments comply with certain design standards for storm water runoff. A copy of the permit, including required new development standards, is available for viewing and download at the State Water Resources Control Board's website at: www.swrcb.ca.gov/stormwtr/municipal.html.

Post Construction Requirements
The General Permit and the Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems Permit (MS4 General Permit), requires the preparation and submittal of specific information regarding post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated in the project to mitigate pollutants. Post-construction storm water management in areas undergoing new development or redevelopment is necessary because runoff from these areas has been shown to significantly affect receiving waterbodies. As stated in the Environmental Protection Agency MS4 Phase II Final Rule, many studies indicate that prior planning and design for minimization of pollutants in post-construction storm water discharges is the most cost-effective approach to storm water quality management.

Therefore, the project development plans and environmental review documents prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) should indicate that the proposed project applicant shall prepare an NOI, a SWPPP and post construction storm water development plans, as discussed above, and submit copies to the Regional Water Board for review, to mitigate pollutants from the new development proposed on the site. The development plans should contain specific structural and non-structural post-construction BMPs, such as grassed swales, bioretention, porous pavement, treatment vaults, retention of buffer strips, minimization of impervious surfaces, etc, and approximate locations of each BMP. For more information go to: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/stormwtr/post_construction.html.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter please contact me at (530) 224-4784 or by email at szaitz@waterboards.ca.gov.

Scott A. Zaitz, R.E.H.S.
Environmental Scientist
Storm Water & Water Quality Certification Unit

SAZ: cg

cc: City of Chico Planning Services Department, Chico
From: Minor, Cliff (Retired) [CMinor@csuchico.edu]
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2007 11:39 AM
To: uhfs1
Subject: CSUC University Housing and Food Service (UHFS) Phase 1 complex (proposed project)

UHFS Ph 1/CEQA
In care of:
ESA
8950 Cal Center drive
Building 3, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

RE: CSUC Proposed Construction of a University Housing and Food Service Phase 1 Complex

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

My wife and I have lived in the Mansion Park neighborhood for twenty-four years. We are concerned about the proposed CSUC construction work to the west of our residence based on 1) problems that arose in the past associated with earlier CSUC construction projects, and 2) the prospect of even greater parking problems for us and our neighbors due to a greater population density and parking needs that will come with two new buildings.

1) Our next door neighbor, who had resided here since the 1940s, told us that during the 1969-70 construction of Holt Hall (across the street from her residence), the construction crew pumped out a substantial amount of water from an underground lake situated under our properties, including the site of Holt Hall, and this resulted in the cracking of swimming pools in the neighborhood. Since similar underground water problems prompted extensive pumping and draining activity with the construction of the expanded Bell Memorial Union complex to the south of campus during the late 1990s, we are concerned about the prospect of a similar need of draining in this new complex that could generate subsidence problems and structural cracking in existing neighboring structures, including our home.

2) Ever since our move to Mansion Avenue we have seen a steady increase in parking problems due to an inadequate amount of available parking space for faculty, staff, and students of the university as well as residents of the Mansion Park neighborhood. Currently we are often unable to park in front of our house due to university personnel and students parking there. Some students and others even park in the alley area between Mansion Avenue and Legion that has on past occasions obstructed regular neighborhood vehicular traffic (sanitation can pickup). This has proved to be a great inconvenience to us. It is an even greater nuisance for service people working for us who are unable to park their vans or trucks to carry out their services.

Your Notice of Intent memorandum to us states that “the residence portion will house 228 people …”, but it neglects to consider the food service personnel who will be working here and the fact that this facility will serve not only Whitney Hall residents, but “all on-campus student residents” — a change that will generate a greater population density to this area (if you are including all residence halls (Esken, Mechoopda, Konkow, Lassen, Shasta, and Whitney Halls)). Furthermore, the building of this 32,000 square feet complex will occur where “bicycle and permitted ADA vehicular parking” currently exists. Removal of this parking area is going to make parking space even less available than at present (and it is already a serious problem), causing even greater difficulties for the students and university personnel who have previous utilized this space and will have to look elsewhere — all of which will generate even further congestion in the Mansion Park area.

While CSUC has assessed the consequences of this proposed construction and sees “no significant environmental effects” with its execution, we very much disagree with these conclusions based on past history and current conditions resulting from CSUC construction projects and increases in university personnel and the student population with inadequate parking facilities.

We hope that CSUC will address these problems and act on them before proceeding with this proposed construction that will adversely affect the Mansion Park neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Sharon and Cliff Minor
336 Mansion Avenue
Chico, CA 95926
(530) 893-0869
August 16, 2007

ESA
8950 Cal Center Drive
Building 3
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95826

Attn: Brian Grattidge, Project Manager

Re: UHFS Ph 1/CEQA

Dear Brian,

Once again, we find ourselves writing to respond to a proposal by California State University, Chico, our alma mater, that will adversely impact the historic Mansion Park Neighborhood, in which we live.

A five-story university housing and food service facility to house 228 people and which would include the main dining area for all the dorms in the area is not what we, as Mansion Park neighbors, would consider an attractive addition to our neighborhood! It completely appalls us that you and the university continue to ignore the fact that this is an old, established, rather unique and beautiful neighborhood which actually enhances the beauty of the CSU campus! Most of the homes in this neighborhood have been here much longer than many of the buildings on the campus, including the dorms. There is pride of ownership in this neighborhood in which many professional people live. For many years we have considered ourselves good neighbors of the University and now it is becoming increasingly apparent that the University, in its zeal to grow and expand, intends to do so without even considering the effects it will have on its neighbors!

In the memorandum, it states that the UHFS Phase 1 complex is “bounded by a track and playing fields for the nearby Chico Senior High School to the north, a parking lot and Tehama Hall to the south, Shasta and Lassen Halls to the east, and Whitney Hall to the west.” The memorandum doesn’t even mention that much closer to the proposed structure are actually single family HOMES and a NEIGHBORHOOD which would be SEVERELY impacted by this project! It goes on to state that “…no significant environmental effects are associated with this project.” REALLY? We completely disagree!
We believe that:

- “sustained pile driving” will most definitely be a negative environmental effect! These homes were built in the 20’s and 30’s and the walls are lathe and plaster- you don’t think “sustained pile driving” would affect them? We know it would!
- The loss of 12 handicapped parking spaces on that side of the University would be most unwelcome to those who need them.
- The Mansion Park Neighborhood would be adversely impacted by even more noise than it is exposed to now- loud stereos, screaming and yelling at all hours of the night, not to mention increased traffic through the neighborhood. Even though the students are encouraged not to bring cars, they most certainly do bring them, drive them and park them!

We think the University could be much more creative in coming up with a solution to house more students that would take into consideration the beauty and integrity of this historic neighborhood. We hope that as the University continues to expand to meet the needs of more students, that they will be good neighbors and recognize that the Mansion Park Neighborhood is one of Chico’s “gems”- it’s one of the things that draws students to CSU Chico and also draws the admiration of their parents as well. We are keenly aware each year at CSUC graduation, the number of parents and relatives who stroll through this charming neighborhood and admire it. Like it or not, this neighborhood adds to the ambiance of the University as well as the City of Chico. For all the wonderful additions the University brings to Chico, it is still a small town and we strongly resent the fact that the University seems to be trying to shove large buildings on the perimeter of the campus down our throats- hardly paying attention to the fact that we live here year-round and love our homes!

Sincerely,

Lori and Gary Smith

Lori and Gary Smith
645 The Esplanade
Chico, CA 95926
August 1, 2007

Joel Trenalone
California State University, Chico
Facilities Planning Office
Chico, California 95929

CSU Chico Northern California Natural History Museum
State Clearinghouse (SCH) Number: 2007052058

The project corresponding to the subject SCH identification number has come to our attention. The limited project description suggests your project may be an encroachment on the State Adopted Plan of Flood Control. You may refer to the California Code of Regulations, Title 23 and Designated Floodway maps at http://recbd.ca.gov/. Please be advised that your county office also has copies of the Board’s designated floodways for your review. If indeed your project encroaches on an adopted flood control plan, you will need to obtain an encroachment permit from the Reclamation Board prior to initiating any activities. The attached Fact Sheet explains the permitting process. Please note that the permitting process may take as much as 45 to 60 days to process. Also note that a condition of the permit requires the securing all of the appropriate additional permits before initiating work. This information is provided so that you may plan accordingly.

If after careful evaluation, it is your assessment that your project is not within the authority of the Reclamation Board, you may disregard this notice. For further information, please contact me at (916) 574-1249.

Sincerely,

Christopher Huitt
Staff Environmental Scientist
Floodway Protection Section

cc: Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814
Encroachment Permits Fact Sheet

Basis for Authority
State law (Water Code Sections 8534, 8608, 8609, and 8710 – 8723) task the Reclamation Board with enforcing appropriate standards for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted flood control plans. Regulations implementing these directives are found in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23, Division 1.

Area of Reclamation Board Jurisdiction
The adopted plan of flood control under the jurisdiction and authority of the Reclamation Board includes the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries and distributaries and the designated floodways.

Streams regulated by the Reclamation Board can be found in Title 23 Section 112. Information on designated floodways can be found on the Reclamation Board’s website at http://recbd.ca.gov/designated_floodway/ and CCR Title 23 Sections 101 - 107.

Regulatory Process
The Reclamation Board ensures the integrity of the flood control system through a permit process (Water Code Section 8710). A permit must be obtained prior to initiating any activity, including excavation and construction, removal or planting of landscaping within floodways, levees, and 10 feet landward of the landside levee toes. Additionally, activities located outside of the adopted plan of flood control but which may foreseeably interfere with the functioning or operation of the plan of flood control is also subject to a permit of the Reclamation Board.

Details regarding the permitting process and the regulations can be found on the Reclamation Board’s website at http://recbd.ca.gov/ under “Frequently Asked Questions” and “Regulations,” respectively. The application form and the accompanying environmental questionnaire can be found on the Reclamation Board’s website at http://recbd.ca.gov/forms.cfm.

Application Review Process
Applications when deemed complete will undergo technical and environmental review by Reclamation Board and/or Department of Water Resources staff.

Technical Review
A technical review is conducted of the application to ensure consistency with the regulatory standards designed to ensure the function and structural integrity of the adopted plan of flood control for the protection of public welfare and safety. Standards and permitted uses of designated floodways are found in CCR Title 23 Sections 107 and Article 8 (Sections 111 to 137). The permit contains 12 standard conditions and additional special conditions may be placed on the permit as the situation warrants. Special conditions, for example, may include mitigation for the hydraulic impacts of the project by reducing or eliminating the additional flood risk to third parties that may caused by the project.

Additional information may be requested in support of the technical review of
your application pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(4). This information may include but not limited to geotechnical exploration, soil testing, hydraulic or sediment transport studies, and other analyses may be required at any time prior to a determination on the application.

Environmental Review
A determination on an encroachment application is a discretionary action by the Reclamation Board and its staff and subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000 et seq.). Additional environmental considerations are placed on the issuance of the encroachment permit by Water Code Section 8608 and the corresponding implementing regulations (California Code of Regulations – CCR Title 23 Sections 10 and 16).

In most cases, the Reclamation Board will be assuming the role of a “responsible agency” within the meaning of CEQA. In these situations, the application must include a certified CEQA document by the “lead agency” [CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(2)]. We emphasize that such a document must include within its project description and environmental assessment of the activities for which are being considered under the permit.

Encroachment applications will also undergo a review by an interagency Environmental Review Committee (ERC) pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 10. Review of your application will be facilitated by providing as much additional environmental information as pertinent and available to the applicant at the time of submission of the encroachment application.

These additional documentations may include the following documentation:

- California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Notification (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/1600/),

- Clean Water Act Section 404 applications, and Rivers and Harbors Section 10 application (US Army Corp of Engineers),

- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and

- corresponding determinations by the respective regulatory agencies to the aforementioned applications, including Biological Opinions, if available at the time of submission of your application.

The submission of this information, if pertinent to your application, will expedite review and prevent overlapping requirements. This information should be made available as a supplement to your application as it becomes available. Transmittal information should reference the application number provided by the Reclamation Board.

In some limited situations, such as for minor projects, there may be no other agency with approval authority over the project, other than the encroachment permit by Reclamation Board. In these limited instances, the Reclamation Board
may choose to serve as the "lead agency" within the meaning of CEQA and in most cases the projects are of such a nature that a categorical or statutory exemption will apply. The Reclamation Board cannot invest staff resources to prepare complex environmental documentation.

Additional information may be requested in support of the environmental review of your application pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(4). This information may include biological surveys or other environmental surveys and may be required at anytime prior to a determination on the application.
August 20, 2007

Ms. Jenna Wright
Facilities Planning
California State University, Chico
Chico, California 95929-0118

Comment Response

UNIVERSITY HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICES BUILDING
Chico, California
WKA No. 7123.01P

In response to concerns from homeowners regarding pile driving, and basement excavation and dewatering for the proposed University Housing and Food Services building we offer the following comments.

Vibrations transmitted through soil as a result of pile driving dissipate with distance from the pile. Vibration dissipation is dependent on the soil type; on soft soil sites such as that of the CSU, Chico Housing and Food Services project, soil vibration dissipation will be relatively rapid, posing minimal risk to nearby structures.

However, despite the low likelihood of vibration-associated damage, vibrations resulting from pile driving activities are frequently blamed for pre-existing damage to nearby structures. Therefore, we recommend that an acoustics-monitoring consultant be retained to conduct a study of ground vibrations at various distances from pile-driving operations at the site. It is suggested that initial monitoring be coordinated with the test and indicator pile program to determine the effects of the production pile driving on adjacent structures.

Recent excavations for the CSU, Chico Wildcat Activity Center indicates that ground water elevations within the area of the activity center have dropped approximately six to nine feet, to an elevation of approximately 172 feet mean sea level, since the initial exploration of March 27 and 28, 2006. This is consistent with other historic well data in the CSU, Chico area. Based on this data we anticipate that ground water elevations in the area of University Housing and Food Services building have likely fluctuated on the order of five to ten feet.

Fluctuations in ground water elevations will result in settlement of soils due to the increase of the effective stress as the soils become free of ground water. As a result, areas that have experienced ground water fluctuations have also experienced any settlement that may occur. Therefore, lowering the ground water elevation on the order of five to ten feet within the area of the proposed basement will likely not result in damaging settlements of adjacent structures.
If you have specific questions regarding this letter, please give me a call.

Wallace-Kuhl and Associates, Inc.

Troy W. Kamisky
Senior Project Engineer